

Conceptual Framework for Integrating Competitive Intelligence into Organizational Strategy Through an Information Resources Management Perspective

Prof. Haliso, Yacob¹, Adeleye, Esther Olubunmi²

^{1,2}*Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria*

Abstract—The merger of information resources management (IRM) with competitive intelligence (CI) illustrates an interesting theoretical barrier for strategy management research. For businesses that operate in an unstable, resource-constrained situations, such as those prevalent across sub-Saharan Africa and Nigeria in particular, this concept is crucial. This study employed a qualitative, interpretive research approach with a constructivist epistemological basis. In order to present CI as an embedded and corporate information resource skill that exactly influences strategic planning, decision-making, and flexible response to environmental variability, this study develops a conceptual framework. Leveraging on the resource-based view (RBV), dynamic capabilities theory (DCT), and knowledge-based perspectives, the framework incorporates the CI intelligence cycle with IRM values. This allows organizations to methodically gather, process, and formalize competitive information. By incorporating global theoretical development with African empirical data from Kenyan businesses, Ghanaian SMEs, South African state institutions, and Nigerian banking and telecom sectors, the paradigm is set in the contextual realities of growing market competition. This essay delves deeper into the moderating roles of digital transformation, organizational learning, and AI-enabled analytics in enhancing CI's strategic values. There includes the discussion of theoretical contributions, managerial implications, and future empirical research that are particularly relevant to the African environment.

Index Terms—Information resource management, competitive intelligence, organizational strategy, competitive intelligence embeddedness, digital transformation, artificial intelligence.

I. INTRODUCTION

The modern competitive environment is marked by volatility, complexity, and ambiguity elements that considerably enhance the premium put on timely, accurate and actionable knowledge. In comparison to their less knowledgeable competitors, organizations that are able to predict changes in the market, decipher competitor intents, and reallocate resources appropriately hold structurally superior strategic advantages. However, the academic and practitioner communities have it difficult to develop an integrated, theoretically based model that outlines how competitive intelligence should be collected, managed, and institutionally embedded in order to effectively inform organizational strategy, despite this widely recognized importance.

As broadly defined, competitive intelligence is the process of methodically gathering and evaluating data from various sources regarding products, clients, supplies, competitors, and any facet of the external business environment required to assist executive and managerial strategic decision-making (Strategic Consortium of Intelligence Professionals (SCIP), 2023). In a critical analysis of the literature, Maluleka and Chummun (2023a) discovered that, despite the field's growth, most writers have not looked at how CI leads to strategy implementation and that CI has not been sufficiently linked to the evaluation and monitoring of organizational strategies. This theoretical vacuum is made worse by geographical elements because most peer-reviewed CI research has been done in North America and Europe, therefore the structures of CI acceptance and efficacy in African context have not been thoroughly studied (Maluleka & Chummun, 2023a).

This is a serious omission given the particular competitive forces that Nigerian and larger African organization must contend with, including infrastructure constraints, inconsistent regulations, unregulated market rivalry, and rapidly advancing technical advancement. When combined, these elements create an environment that is very risky for effective intelligence management (Chukwuka & Imide, 2024; Iyamabor, et al. 2023). An intelligence surplus, which is a plethora of knowledge that never becomes a competitive advantage, occurs when intelligence is collected without institutional frameworks for turning it into strategic actions.

A corrective theoretical perspective is provided by the field of information resource management (IRM). It is all-encompassing strategy to managing data across its entire lifecycle, from production to disposal. Instead of seeing information as merely a technological item, it sees it as a tactical organizational asset that is guided by planning, organization, directing, and regulating principles (Dalvoys Expert Team, 2026). The methodical implementation of IRM concepts to CI activity anticipates a more structured, organizational-wide approach to competitive information handling, where intelligence is distributed throughout the value chain as a universal organizational competence rather than isolated within a specialized CI unit.

Through the lens of information resources management (IRM), this research aims to fill that gap by putting forth a conceptual framework that incorporates competitive intelligence into organizational strategy. Therefore, Section 2 describes the methodological technique that supports the paper's systematic literature evaluation and framework design process. Section 3 examines the theoretical basis of the concept; The CI process and its relationship to strategic planning are examined in Section 4; The fundamental IRM-CI integration paradigm is developed in Section 5; Section 6 covers the function of digital enablers and dynamic capabilities, while the complete conceptual framework is presented in Section 7, and theoretical and practical consequences, constraints, and future research directions are covered in Section 8.

II. METHODOLOGY

The research design adopted in this work is qualitative and interpretive, with a constructive epistemological

foundation. This investigation's main goal is conceptual framework creation, a recognized and esteemed kind of academic submission in management research, particularly in fields where experimental effort has outpaced conceptual integration (Tamirat & Amentie, 2023). Instead of testing theories or producing statistical results, the study's objective is to combine current theoretical and empirical data into a coherent, descriptive model that may guide further empirical investigations as well as organizational behavior. This process correlates with the strategic management theory-based paradigm, which constructs frameworks through strict theoretical analysis and deliberate engagement with relevant literature (Jasim, 2025).

The main philosophical principle of the study is interpretivism. According to this perspective, knowledge is created by the researcher's conceptually informed engagement with prior studies rather than being uncovered by objective observation. Consequently, the model created here is not a blank canvas inference from data, but rather a purposeful theoretical integration. This approach makes sense considering the goal of the paper, which is to create a relationship-based model that identifies inherent features not apparent within any one theoretical tradition by integrating bodies of ideas that have developed generally in parallel, such as CI theory, IRM theory, and dynamic capabilities theory.

III. SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW PROTOCOL

According to the suggestions of Mishra and Mishra (2023), comprehensive literature review was carried out in conformity with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) standards, modified for management research and forms the basis of the theoretical framework. A PRISMA-informed systematic review was executed across The Association for Information Systems (AIS) eLibrary, Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search strings combined three core clusters which are competitive intelligence (CI), information resource management (IRM), and organizational strategy/dynamic capabilities plus secondary terms (organizational learning, strategic foresight, AI analytics). All of the chosen databases'

title, abstract, and keywords fields were subjected to full search strings.

In acknowledgement of the field's swift progression, especially with regard to Artificial Intelligence (AI) incorporation and digital transformation, the review's temporal boundary was set at 2019-2026, with a focus on publications from 2023 onward. Foundational theoretical contributions that predated this window, such as the resource-based view (Barney, 1991), dynamic capabilities theory (Teece et al., 1997), and organizational sense-making (Weick, 1995), were included based on their ongoing theoretical centrality, in line with standard practice in systematic reviews that aim to ground conceptual frameworks in both seminar and contemporary literature (Mishra & Mishra, 2023).

IV. INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA

The inclusion criteria required substantive coverage of at least one core cluster and publication in peer-reviewed journals, reputable book chapters, or conference proceedings, and practitioners reports were included only when they provided unique market data not available in peer-reviewed sources. Exclusion removed studies focused solely on database systems or national security intelligence. From an initial 847 records, screening produced a final corpus of 68 high-impact sources that directly informed framework construction, supplemented by forward and backward citation tracking to capture foundational theoretical contributions (Maluleka & Chummun, 2023a).

V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The theoretical structure was constructed using the four steps outlined in the guidelines for management studies as thus: (1) domain identification, which establishes both the theoretical and practical scope of the study; (2) construct mapping, which recognizes the primary principles and their functional definitions within each theoretical sphere; (3) relational theorizing, which describes the postulated relationships, adjusting factors, and response dynamic linking the concepts; and (4) framework synthesis that combines the constructs and interactions into an organized, clearly recognizable model with assertive statement (Shiferaw & Kero, 2024). During this

process, theoretical correlation was utilized to verify that the basic structure concepts were rooted in multiple theoretical paradigm as opposed to a sole tradition. The simultaneous application of the resource-based view (RBV), dynamic capabilities theory, and organizational learning theory as supplement, jointly strengthening descriptive structure is a conscious methodological option that enhances the theoretical quality of the final model and minimizes the potential for the theoretical ambiguity.

VI. VALIDITY CONSIDERATIONS

The credibility of this theoretical research depends on the several control procedures. First, the above-described systematic literature review methodology guarantees that the framework is based on a representative and carefully chosen body of knowledge rather than a haphazard selection of handy references. Second, the framework's fundamental relational claims are strengthened by a type of theoretical triangulation made possible by the application of several theoretical lenses. Third, rather than functioning solely at the level of a preceding reasoning, the framework's propositional logic is assessed against current empirical findings throughout the text to ensure that theoretical claims are disciplined accessible evidence. One acknowledged drawback of conceptual framework articles is that more empirical testing is ultimately necessary to determine the validity of the framework. The Competitive Intelligence Strategic Integration Framework (CISIF) framework is presented in this study as a propositional model that needs empirical validation rather a tested theory, and it expressly acknowledges this shortcoming.

VII. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Based on the groundbreaking work of Penrose (1959) and later codified by Barney (1991), the resource-based view (RBV) posits that organizations can gain a sustainable competitive advantage by having resources that are valuable, uncommon, unique, and non-replaceable. When appropriately managed and contextualized, information as a strategic resource meets several of these requirements. A long-lasting strategic asset is knowledge that is firm-specific, subtly inherent in organizational procedures, and

challenging to see the outside. Competitive intelligence, that could be referred to as proprietary environmental knowledge, can become just such an asset when it is methodically selected and capacity mapping are better positioned to transform informational inputs into long-term strategic advantage (Jasim, 2025). According to empirical research on organizational learning and competitive advantage, Keya and Kinyua (2025) contend that efficient knowledge resource management significantly improves a firm's competitive position, especially by facilitating adaptive responses to environmental change. As a knowledge-generating process, CI is therefore an integral part of a company's knowledge architecture rather than just a tactical tool.

VIII. DYNAMIC CAPABILITY THEORY

Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) and Teece (2025), in response to environmental changes, established the dynamic capabilities framework, which discusses how organizations refresh competencies. The ability of an organization to integrate, develop, and configure internal and external competences in response to market dynamics is known as dynamic capabilities (Shiferaw & Kero, 2024). The structure makes a distinction between sensing, which involves recognizing opportunities and threats, seizing, which involves mobilizing resources to address them, and reconfiguring, which involves changing the organization as necessary. Competitive Intelligence closely relates to this structure's sensing dimension. An effective CI system allows businesses to recognize rival weaknesses, spot warning signs, and foresee technological or regulatory upheaval prior to their forming into crises.

Teece (2024), points out that in a digital environment, where competitive criteria change quickly and new information sources are always emerging, the system-level understanding of dynamic capabilities is even more crucial. This finding emphasizes the need to integrate competitive intelligence into the organization's dynamic capabilities infrastructure as opposed to viewing it as a sporadic, project-based endeavor.

IX. ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING THEORY

A third theoretical pillar is provided by organizational learning theory. Organizational learning theory explains how raw intelligence becomes shared mental models, updated strategies, and revised routine (Tamirat & Amentie, 2023). Competitive embeddedness depends on culture, knowledge management infrastructure, and top management commitment (Maluleka and Chummun, 2023b). These results support the claim made by Hendricks et al. (2024), in the context of AI-augmented organizational learning that whether firms actively form or conform to their surroundings depends on how well learning processes are coordinated. Together, these three theoretical pillars provide complementary lenses for understanding CI as both resource and capability embedded in organizational processes.

X. COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE PROCESS AND STRATEGIC RELEVANCE

The competitive intelligence process is typically depicted as a cyclical, continuous sequence that includes the following steps: (1) planning and direction, which establishes intelligence requirements in line with organizational strategy; (2) collection, which gathers raw data from primary and secondary sources; (3) processing and analysis, which transform data into meaningful intelligence; (4) dissemination, which provides intelligence to decision-makers; and (5) feedback and evaluation, which evaluates the quality of intelligence and improves the process (Maluleka & Chummun, 2023a). Empirical research continues to find discrepancies between the phases of collection and dissemination, and more crucially, between dissemination and strategic use, despite this well-established paradigm. Maluleka and Chummun (2023a) noted that competitive intelligence was not regularly shown to have a tangible relationship with the monitoring and adjustment of organizational strategies, pointing out a continuous gap in the research between strategy execution and CI creation. The standard formulation of the intelligence cycle, according to this insight, underspecifies the organizational processes that transfer intelligence into action.

XI. COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE AS ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY

The function is reframed from a procedure to a competence, a firm-specific capability that can be created, improved, and strategically implemented in a capability-based view of continuous improvement. The degree to which CI permeates the whole organization such that strategic and tactical decisions are adopted with full knowledge of pertinent external competition information is known as CI embeddedness (CIE) Maluleka and Chummun (2023c). With this approach, the focus is shifted from CI as a departmental function to CI as a systematic organizational competency that needs to be measured, developed, and coordinated with strategic planning procedures. Additionally, organizations with top-notch market intelligence skills have shown shareholder value growth that is far higher than the averages of the global stock market over similar time frames (Kärkkäinen, 2025). In African contexts, CI has been linked to SME survival, parsimonious innovation, and resilience under macroeconomic turbulence (Azage & Ogbeide, 2026; Ledi, 2024; Chuckwu & Imide 2024). These findings underscore the practical importance of embedding CI into organizational routines rather than confining it to special units.

XII. COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE FORMULATION VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION

Competitive intelligence's contribution to strategy creation and strategy implementation differs significantly from another in theory. On the former, the literature is significantly more advanced. It is often known that CI is useful or competitor profiling, SWOT analysis, environmental scanning, and opportunity identification. According to Maluleka and Chummun (2023a), there is still a lack of theoretical development about its function in directing execution, permitting mid-course modifications, and enlightening performance assessment. Evidence from Nigeria's financial sector, which demonstrated that CI considerably raised the caliber of services offered in deposit money institutions in South-East Nigeria, supports this observation (Iranus et al., 2021). The authors highlighted that true CI institutionalization in Nigerian banking remained largely informal and

reactive rather than systematically embedded, though they further advised that banks incorporate specialist CI divisions in order to constantly acquire intelligence for making strategic decisions.

XIII. INFORMATION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES APPLIED TO COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE

Information resource management (IRM) treats information as a lifecycle asset requiring governance, architecture, quality control, and preservation (Choo, 2006; Kettinger, et al., 2021). First, rather applying IRM to CI shifts CI as an ad hoc activity, CI needs to be handled as a controlled asset. This calls for written information policies that specify who gathers competitive data, from what sources, in accordance with what verification and analytical criteria, and for what decision contexts. Second, in order to offer contextualized intelligence rather than separate competitor profiles, CI must be guided by a data architecture that combines competitive information with internal organizational data, such as financial performance, operational indicators, and consumer behavior.

Third, CI must be subject to quality management procedures that are similar to those used for other organizational data assets, according to an IRM methodology. Despite evidences that low-quality intelligence, characterized by unreliability, incompleteness, or analytical mistake, can result in worse strategic outcomes than no intelligence at all, the quality of market information is a characteristic that current CI models have mainly overlooked (Maluleka & Chummun, 2023c). fourth, in order to enable intelligence to last beyond the tenure of individual analysts and accumulate as organizational memory that influences long-term strategic decisions, IRM principles require that CI be integrated into knowledge management systems.

XIV. THE INFORMATION VALUE CHAIN

The information value chain, which is the series of changes that turn unprocessed environmental data into strategically relevant knowledge, is a helpful organizing idea inside the IRM-CI integration. The five phases that this chain goes through are data gathering, data processing, intelligence synthesis,

strategic translation, and organizational action. Different organizational capabilities are needed for each stage, that is, source identification, monitoring tools, and collection protocols that are necessary for the data acquisition stage, analytical skills in pattern recognition, competitive modeling, and scenario development are necessary for the synthesis stage; and institutional mechanism, such as executive briefing structure, strategic planning processes, and decision support systems, are necessary for the strategic translation stage to translate intelligence into organizational decisions.

Caputo et al. (2023) asserts in the *Journal of Knowledge Management* that organizations must develop really human-centered capacities for strategic analysis and sense-making, going beyond technology big data management solutions. This justification highlights the need for expert human judgement throughout the whole information value chain, particularly when it pertains to the passage from intelligence fusion to strategy application.

XV. DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AND AI IN COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE

A. Digital transformation as CI enabler and disruptor
In addition to increasing in the amount of competitive data that organizations have access to, digital transformation has also made it more difficult to derive strategic meaning from that data. Blockchain, big data analytics, and AI alter strategic planning and execution by enabling more responsive information processing and strategic agility (Mbabu & Ombok, 2024; Ojeda et al., 2025). However, digital change also introduces new pressures like data quality issues, infrastructure unreliability, and regulatory uncertainty, which are specifically salient in many African contexts (Egala et al. 2024; Chukwuka & Imide, 2024). Digital maturity therefore moderates the effectiveness of CI integration.

Similar to CI-sensing function in the CISIF framework, Onunga and Odhiambo (2025), who looked at dynamic capabilities and strategic quality management among Kenyan firms, discovered that companies that methodically developed sensing and reconfiguring capabilities achieved more successful digital transformations. According to Chukwuka and Imide (2024), African organizations face additional challenge. Not only must CI governance structures

absorb new, fast-moving digital information streams, but they must do so in environments that are often marked by unreliable digital infrastructure, uneven data quality, and regulatory uncertainty.

B. Artificial intelligence and machine learning in CI

It is becoming more widely accepted that machine learning and artificial intelligence will revolutionize CI practice. AI-powered systems could develop models for forecasting future market conditions, identify trends in rival activity that human analysts would fail to observe, and automate an inventory and preliminary processing of enormous volume of competitive data. (Alyasat et al., 2025; Ojeda et al. 2025). Moreover, field evidence in Strategic Science demonstrating that incorporating AI actually enhances strategic decision-making accuracy, especially when dealing with environments with high information intricacy. The results obtained demonstrate that AI-enabled analytics is a crucial of the intended IRM-CI integration infrastructure (Ceasar et al. 2024). However, governance, interpretative ability, and ethical monitoring are necessary for AI to be strategically valuable; without these, businesses run the risk of producing intelligence surpluses that do not result in an advantage.

XVI. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A. The CI-IRM Strategy Integration Framework

The recommended conceptual framework, termed the CI-IRM Strategic Integration Framework (CISIF), comprises three interrelated categories, which are:

Information Governance Layer: This is the institutional framework for handling competitive information as a strategic source. It consists an intelligence requirements system that is in line with key intelligence topics and strategy planning cycles, source management procedures that control the quality assessment, monitoring, and selection of information source, competitive information architecture that integrates CI data with internal organizational information systems, and knowledge management systems that store and distribute intelligence over time and between organizational units.

CI Process Layer: This operationalized intelligence cycle within the IRM governance framework. Crucially, this layer adds phases to the traditional CI cycle that the traditional model does not fully specify,

a strategic translation phase where CI analysts collaborate with strategy teams to translate intelligence syntheses into strategic implications and option, and an implementation monitoring phase where CI activity focuses on tracking strategy execution and identifying competitive developments that might necessitate strategic adaptation.

Strategic Impact Layer: This links the CI-IRM system to organizational strategy. The framework guarantees that CI activity is not unduly focused on short-term competitor monitoring at the expense of longer-term environmental scanning and foresight by clearly defining these three time periods.

B. Moderating variables

The efficacy of the CI-IRM integration specified by the framework is moderated by a number of organizational factors. Maluleka and Chummun (2023c) point to top management commitment as the main factor influencing CI embeddedness. Without executive support, CI stays a supporting role with no real strategic impact. Equally crucial is organizational culture, especially one that emphasizes information exchange, construct criticism, and evidence-based decision-making. Competitive intelligence thrives in organizations where challenging strategic hypotheses is normatively accepted and when intelligence findings are genuinely incorporated into strategic discussions rather than getting rejected through validation bias.

Digital maturity also influences how successful CI is. The AI-enabled potentials earlier outlined are better suited for organizations with established digital architectures, such as enterprise data platform, sophisticated analytics capabilities, and strong cybersecurity infrastructure (Kärkkäinen, 2025), and knowledge management competence. These contingencies determine whether CI becomes embedded and actionable. Digital maturity is a especially crucial moderator in the Nigerian context. Kolawole, et al (2024) demonstrated that digital financial services incorporated importantly enhanced operation among quoted commercial banks in Nigeria, highlighting the competitive stakes of digital infrastructure investments in a market where technology platforms are increasingly mediating CI and strategy.

C. Feedback and adaptive learning

One of the CISIF architecture's special aspect is the specific incorporation of versatile feedback procedures. The concept sees the interaction between CI activity and organizational strategy as an evolving, co-creative system where intelligence outcomes impact strategic decisions and strategic decision influence intelligence objectives, rather than as a sequential input-output model. Through agent-based simulation, Hendricks, et al. (2024) show that the most successful organizations synchronize human AI training procedures in ways that enable both AI and humans to continue to environmental enactment rather than just adaptation. This realization is incorporated into CISIF framework, which defines CI as both a sensing activity (identifying what offers) and a shaping activity (contributing intelligence that enables firms impact their competitive surroundings through strategic decision).

XVII. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATION, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

A. Theoretical contribution

The CISIF framework makes three theoretical contributions. First, it bridges the gap between CI process theory and strategic management by connecting intelligence activity to strategy execution and not just formulation, addressing a gap previously identified by Maluleka & Chummun (2023a). Second, it repositions CI as a dynamic organizational capability requiring deliberate development and governance, rather than passive information gathering, drawing on dynamic capability's theory and the resource-based view to elevate CI to a strategic asset. Third, it expands IRM beyond internal data to include external competitive information, applying IRM principles like lifecycle management and quality governance to CI, creating a new theoretical synthesis with practical implications.

B. Managerial implications

The CISIF framework serves as both a diagnostic and prescriptive tool, helping organizations identify and address weaknesses across three layers, that is, information governance, CI process, and strategic impact. For African and Nigerian organizations specifically, the framework is particularly relevant. Research consistently shows that while CI awareness

is relatively high, actual institutionalization remains low. Evidence from Nigerian SMEs indicates that competitor intelligence often fails to translate into strategic outcomes, suggesting organizations are better at reading general market signals than converting competitor-specific knowledge into action (Iyamabhor et al., 2023; Irenaus et al., 2021, and Azage and Ogbeide, 2026). CISIF addresses this by providing standardized tools for strategy translation and implementation monitoring.

The framework stresses that the most neglected CI phases, strategic translation and implementation monitoring are also the most critical. Even resource-constrained organization can achieve meaningful CI-strategy integration without expensive platforms, simply by embedding disciplined intelligence habits into existing planning routines and fostering collaborations between CI analysts and strategy teams. This is supported by Ledi's (2024) finding that cost-effective innovation can link CI to value creation, offering a practical pathway for African SMEs with limited financial capacity. Investment in staff development further amplifies this potential.

Finally, the framework cautions against over-reliance on AI-driven CI systems without adequate human sense-making capacity. While AI accelerates information processing, strategic value ultimately depends on human judgment and interpretation. Organizations that invest heavily in AI collection without building analytical and institutional sense-making capabilities risk intelligence overload rather than competitive advantage.

C. Limitation and future research

Future research should prioritize empirical validation of the CISIF framework across diverse organizational types, industries, and national contexts. Since CI literature has been developed predominantly in North American and European settings, with limited attention to developing economies, testing CISIF in Nigerian and broader African contexts is essential (Maluleka & Chummun, 2023a). Promising sectors include banking, telecommunications, oil and gas, manufacturing, and SMEs, insurance companies, telecommunications, and macroeconomic development (Irenaus, et al., 2021; Muritala, et al., 2019; Iyamabhor, et al., 2023; Chukwuka & Imide, 2024).

Special attention should also be given to the role of AI in CI-IRM capabilities evolve, questions around accountability, interpretive authority, and governance of AI-generated intelligence will become increasingly important. Future research must address the implications of generative AI, particularly its ability to stimulate competitor behavior and produce intelligence reports, for strategic decision-making (López-Solís, et al., 2025). In the African context, where AI adoption among SMEs is constrained by limited financing, infrastructure gaps, and skills shortage, research is needed to develop context-appropriate CI-IRM models that deliver meaningful results within realistic resource limitation (Nwagbala, et al., 2025).

In conclusion, more thorough theoretical analysis of the ethical issues of CI is warranted in the African regulatory environment. The less formalized information environments typical of many African markets may make it more difficult to distinguish between improper acquisition of proprietary information and competitive intelligence obtained from public accessible sources (Strategic Consortium of Intelligence Professionals, 2023). An ethical governance factor that outlines the organizational procedures and guiding principles for reporting CI practices in various institutional contexts must be included in a theoretically sound CI-IRM framework.

XVIII. CONCLUSION

In order to integrate competitive intelligence into organizational strategy through the institutional mechanisms of information resource management, this study has suggested the CI-IRM Strategic Integration Framework (CISIF), a theoretically based model. The framework presents CI as a dynamic organizational capability whose strategic value relies on the quality of the governance is converted into organizational action rather than the quantity of intelligence generated. It does this by drawing on the resource-based view, dynamic capabilities theory, and organizational learning perspectives.

By explicitly expanding the intelligence cycle to include strategy implementation and adaptive monitoring as well as by placing CI within an IRM governance architecture that views competitive information as a managed organizational asset, the framework fills a long-standing vacuum in the CI

literature. In an era of accelerating digital information, AI-enabled analytics, and increased competitive turbulence, organizations seeking sustained competitive advantage must methodically integrate CI into organizational strategy through principled information resource management. This is not only a theoretical goal but also a practical necessity.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Alhyasat, E. Alhyasat, and S. A. Khattab, "Technology trends in strategic management in the AI era: Systematic literature review," *Human Systems Management*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 764–781, 2025, doi: 10.1177/01672533251322396.
- [2] J. Azage and D. O. Ogbeide, "Competitive intelligence and SMEs' sustainability in Nigeria," *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Business*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 69–84, 2026, doi: 10.24123/jeb.v7i1.7903.
- [3] F. Caputo, B. Keller, M. Möhring, L. Carrubbo, and R. Schmidt, "Advancing beyond technicism when managing big data in companies' decision-making," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 27, no. 10, pp. 2797–2809, 2023, doi: 10.1108/JKM-10-2022-0794.
- [4] C. W. Choo, *The Knowing Organization: How Organizations Use Information to Construct Meaning, Create Knowledge, and Make Decisions*, 2nd ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006.
- [5] E. J. Chukwuka and I. Imide, "The role of competitive intelligence on Nigeria's economic development," *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 154–170, 2024, doi: 10.56201/ijebm.v10.no7.2024.
- [6] F. A. Csaszar, H. Ketkar, and H. Kim, "Artificial intelligence and strategic decision-making: Evidence from entrepreneurs and investors," *Strategy Science*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 322–345, 2024, doi: 10.1287/stsc.2024.0190.
- [7] Dalvoy Expert Team, "Information resource management: Definition & features," *Dalvoy*, Jan. 1, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.dalvoy.com/en/upsc/mains/previous-years/2023/management-paper-ii/information-resource-management>. [Accessed: May 5, 2026].
- [8] P. Hendriks, T. Sturm, C. Olt, N. Nan, and P. Buxmann, "Organizational learning and enactment in the era of artificial intelligence," in *ICIS 2024 Proceedings*, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2024/gov_strategy/gov_strategy/1/. [Accessed: May 5, 2026].
- [9] O. N. Irenaus, E. O. Ikechukwu, and P. O. Ndubuisi, "Competitive intelligence and organizational performance in small and medium enterprises in South-East Nigeria," *Review of Strategic Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 43–64, 2021, doi: 10.26708/rs.rm.i11v1.01.
- [10] M. Iyamabor, P. O. Epkeni, O. P. Awosigho, and E. O. Ubogu, "Modern management competitive intelligence strategies and organizational performance," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, vol. 6, no. 11, pp. 5430–5437, 2023, doi: 10.47191/ijmra/v6-i11-56.
- [11] B. H. Jasim, "Strategic management for sustainable competitive advantage: Integrating RBV, dynamic capabilities, digital transformation, and ESG," *South Asian Research Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 420–423, 2025, doi: 10.36346/sarjbm.2025.v07i05.003.
- [12] N. Kärkkäinen, "5 steps to starting your competitive intelligence function," *Valona Intelligence*, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://valonaintelligence.com/resources/blog/insights-blog-competitive-intelligence-best-practices>. [Accessed: May 5, 2026].
- [13] W. J. Kettinger, S. Y. Ryoo, and D. A. Marchand, "We're engaged! Following the path to a successful information management capability," *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, vol. 30, no. 3, Art. no. 101681, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jsis.2021.101681.
- [14] L. W. Keya and G. M. Kinyua, "Organizational learning as an antecedent of competitive advantage: Evidence from review of literature," *International Journal of Education and Research*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 13–38, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://ijern.com/journal/2025/February-2025/02.pdf>. [Accessed: May 5, 2026].
- [15] O. Kolawole, T. A. Muritala, J. O. Akande, and A. O. Adekunle, "Digital financial services and

- the performance of the quoted commercial banks in Nigeria," *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, vol. 9, no. 6, Art. no. e04150, 2024, doi: 10.26668/businessreview/2024.v9i6.4150.
- [16] K. K. Ledi, "Surviving black swan: Competitive intelligence and frugal innovation as panaceas to SME value creation during crisis," *Cogent Business & Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, Art. no. 2405056, 2024, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2024.2405056.
- [17] López-Solís, O., A. Luzuriaga-Jaramillo, M. Bedoya-Jara, J. Naranjo-Santamaría, D. Bonilla-Jurado, and P. Acosta-Vargas, "Effect of generative artificial intelligence on strategic decision-making in entrepreneurial business initiatives: A systematic literature review," *Administrative Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 2, Art. no. 66, 2025, doi: 10.3390/admsci15020066.
- [18] Maluleka, M. L., and B. Z. Chummun, "Competitive intelligence and strategy implementation: Critical examination of present literature review," *South African Journal of Information Management*, vol. 25, no. 1, Art. no. 1610, 2023, doi: 10.4102/sajim.v25i1.1610.
- [19] Maluleka, M. L., and B. Z. Chummun, "Developing a conceptual framework: Influencing the competitive intelligence embeddedness in organisations," *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 1–20, 2023.
- [20] Maluleka, M. L., and B. Z. Chummun, "The function of competitive intelligence in South African insurance post-COVID-19 outbreak," *South African Journal of Information Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, Art. no. 1738, 2024, doi: 10.4102/sajim.v26i1.1738.
- [21] Mbabu, M. M., and B. Ombok, "Leveraging digital information for strategic agility: The role of AI, big data analytics, and blockchain in re-shaping strategic planning and execution," *Greener Journal of Economics and Accountancy*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 21–32, 2024.
- [22] V. Mishra and M. P. Mishra, "PRISMA for review of management literature: Method, merits, and limitations," in *Advancing Methodologies of Conducting Literature Review in Management Domain*, S. Rana and J. Singh, Eds. Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Publishing Limited, 2023, doi: 10.1108/S2754-586520230000002007.
- [23] T. A. Muritala and O. S. Ajetunmobi, "Competitive intelligence and sustainable competitive advantage in Nigerian insurance firms," *Journal of African Business*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 109–125, 2019, doi: 10.1080/15228916.2018.1538903.
- [24] S. C. Nwagbala, F. N. Ezeanokwasa, R. Nwachukwu, N. J. Uzodike, and O. P. Nwosu, "AI adoption and sustainability of SMEs in Africa: Opportunities and challenges," *International Journal of Scientific Research and Allied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 1, Art. no. 0009, 2025, doi: 10.30574/ijrsra.2025.14.1.0009.
- [25] A. M. Ojeda, J. B. Valera, and O. Diaz, "Artificial intelligence of big data for analysis in organizational decision-making," *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 515–527, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40171-025-00450-2.
- [26] J. Onunga and N. Wanja, "Integrating dynamic capabilities and strategic management for effective digital transformation: A systematic review of firms in Kenya," *East African Journal of Business and Economics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 141–154, 2026, doi: 10.37284/eajbe.8.1.4387.
- [27] R. M. Shiferaw and C. A. Kero, "Dynamic capabilities view practices of business firms: A systematic literature review," *Cogent Business & Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, Art. no. 2336309, 2024, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2024.2336309.
- [28] Strategic Consortium of Intelligence Professionals, "About SCIP." Accessed: May 5, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.scip.org/page/About-Us>
- [29] S. Tamirat and C. Amentie, "Advances in knowledge-based dynamic capabilities: A systematic review of foundations and determinants in recent literature," *Cogent Business & Management*, vol. 10, no. 3, Art. no. 2257866, 2023, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2023.2257866.
- [30] D. J. Teece, *Dynamic Capabilities and Related Paradigms*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2025, doi: 10.1017/9781009232890.
- [31] D. J. Teece, G. Pisano, and A. Shuen, "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management,"

Strategic Management Journal, vol. 18, no. 7,
pp. 509–533, 1997, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-
0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-
SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z.

- [32] K. E. Weick, *Sensemaking in Organizations*.
Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications,
1995. ISBN: 978-0-8039-7177-6.